

App. Serial No. 09/759,177
Docket No.: AT 000001 US

Remarks

Applicant respectfully submits that the withdrawal of the Notice of Allowability resulted from a misinterpretation of certain claim language. As such, Applicant traverses the sole rejection and requests that the application again be placed in condition for allowance.

The non-final Office Action dated April 4, 2006 indicated that claims 1-6, 9, 11-14, 17, 20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112(1). According to the Office Action, the basis for this rejection appears to be a misconstruction of the claim 1 term, "characterized in that: the receiving means configuration is configured to be controllable as regards the value of both the at least one second transmission coil and the capacitor configuration", and a similar term found in claim 12. As explained in the Office Action, this term has been construed to mean that both the second transmission coil and the capacitor configuration are controllable. However, these independent claims do not present this claim language as such. Rather, the controllability language applies to the receiving means; thus, the claim states that "the receiving means configuration is configured to be controllable" In both claims 1 and 12, the language "the controllable value" has also been used and is directed to the effective value due to the controllable receiving means. Applicant submits that the skilled artisan would interpret this language accordingly, especially in view of the Specification.

Notwithstanding this apparent misconstruction and Applicant's traversal, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to further clarify as should already be expressly clear by the claim language. In claims 1 and 12, the amendment presents the controlled value as an impedance value effected, e.g., as exemplified in embodiments the Specification.

App. Serial No. 09/759,177
Docket No.: AT 000001 US

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that the §112(1) rejection has been overcome and that the application is (again) in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the attorney overseeing the application file, Adam L. Stroud, of Philips Corporation at (408) 474-9064.

Please direct all correspondence to:

Corporate Patent Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41
San Jose, CA 95131

By: 

Name: Robert J. Crawford
Reg. No.: 32,122
(VLSI.509PA)

CUSTOMER NO. 24738